

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In this, the first Action in the case, the Examiner rejected all claims under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness. In response, applicants have amended the claims to cure the deficiencies identified by the Examiner. As to the assertion that the claims recite matter that is optionally recited and may not actually occur, the Examiner will note that the amended claims recite functionality for both when a condition is met as well as when a condition is not met. Hence, the claim limitations are not optional; they are required, and only the selection of particular functionality is influenced by a condition. In view of the amendments and remarks, applicants request that the Section 112, second paragraph, rejection of their claims as amended be withdrawn.

The Examiner next rejected all claims under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. This rejection is respectfully traversed. The Examiner will note that the element (e) of independent claim 1 clearly and explicitly recites a useful, concrete, and practical result. Hence, the claimed invention is not non-statutory, and applicants request that the Section 101 rejection of their claims as amended be withdrawn.

Finally, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. pat. no. 6,556,984 (Zien et al.) in view of "A Guided Tour to Approximate String Matching" (Navarro). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The only substantial relationship between the references and applicants' claimed invention is that they have a common objective and that they disclose or use dynamic programming and reuse of partial results of computations that are common to a plurality of target texts. But other aspects of the claimed invention -- such as element (h) of claim 1 for example -- are not disclosed, taught, or suggested by the references either alone or in combination.

Likewise, the subject matter recited in claims 3-5, for example, is not disclosed, taught, or suggested by the references either alone or in combination.

In view thereof, applicants request that the Section 103(a) rejection of claims 1, 2, and 5 be withdrawn.

Applicants have taken this opportunity to comport the "Cross Reference to Related Applications" to the format recommended in MPEP §201.11, pp. 200-64 (Rev. 5, Aug. 2006).


The Examiner's rejections having been properly responded to and overcome, applicants respectfully suggest that the application is now in condition for allowance. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the application be reconsidered and thereafter be passed to issue.

Although the foregoing is believed to be dispositive of the issues in the application, if the Examiner should deem that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution, he is invited to call applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Eric T. Bax
Ian Swett

By


David Volejnic
Corporate Counsel
Reg. No. 29355
303-538-4154

Date: 31 October 2006

Avaya Inc.
Docket Administrator
307 Middletown-Lincroft Road
Room 1N-391
Lincroft, NJ 07738